



City of Columbus
Mayor Michael B. Coleman

University Area Review Board

109 North Front Street, First Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215-9031
(614) 645-6096 (614) 645-1483 fax

MEETING SUMMARY

March 25, 2010

**Ted Goodman, Frank Petruziello, George Kane, Bill Graver, Pasquale Grado,
Brian Horne, Doreen Uhas-Sauer**

Daniel Ferdelman

A.

Approval of Minutes

motion

To approve the February Meeting Summary as submitted.

motion by
vote

**Mr. Grado/ Mr. Graver
7-0 to Approve**

B.

Applications for Certificate of Approval

1.

124 East 14th Avenue

Phi Kappa Psi Fraternity

applicant:

Frank Elmer, Mark Ours (Lincoln Street Studio)

to be reviewed:
6:30

remodel, exterior modifications

Mr. Ferdelman presented several slides and reviewed the facts of the application. Mr. Elmer described the scope of work; he noted that all the original windows will be refurbished or replaced with windows having the same material and details. Mr. Petruziello asked what items are changes to the building or site. Mr. Elmer described the changes to the terrace in order to accommodate a new ramp, several new columns to support the deck above, new door at the rear, new dormers in the roof, railings behind the balustrades and some site work. Mr. Petruziello summarized the changes. Mr. Elmer reported the changes to the site to accommodate the A/C Condensers and the relocation of the trash dumpster with new enclosure. Mr. Petruziello questioned the site lighting and the possibility of light effecting the occupants and/or adjacent properties. Mr. Goodman commended the proposed work and stated that it will be a big improvement.

motion

To approve the proposal as submitted on the following conditions:

- **That the landscape lighting be studied for possible affect on adjacent properties.**

motion by
vote

**Mr. Petruziello / Mr. Kane
7-0 to Approve**

2.

1644 North High Street

Nettare Pizza & Coffee

applicant:

Paul Carroll (Allstar Sign)

to be reviewed:
~ 6:45

sign

Mr. Ferdelman presented several slides and reviewed the facts of the application. Mr. Carroll described the process that lead to the current sign design and the sign details; the client (owner) rejected the idea of projecting a sign off the corner of the building. Mr. Goodman asked the material of the awnings. Mr. Carroll stated that they are painted aluminum, high grade paint like automobile paint. Mr. Goodman asked for comments. Mr. Carroll stated the roof mounted sign might be considered at a later date, but would request the Board add any comments regarding its design. Ms. Uhas-Sauer asked what is the true name of the restaurant, it has changed each time the project has been reviewed by the Board. Mr. Carroll stated that the name he was given was Nettare, Italian for nectar. Mr. Petruziello commented that the signs do not compliment the building, they are almost random; a sign on the corner would be better, even these signs. Mr. Goodman stated that the signs should complement the building, these signs do not relate to the entry of the business or to the building. Mr. Carroll showed the Board an example of an earlier sign design the client had rejected. The Board was receptive to the alternate design. Mr. Petruziello stated that the sign should be more vertical, Nettare could be done at a diagonal. There was some back and forth comments regarding elements in the design that replicated the form of a football. Mr. Ferdelman asked whether there were comments on other design items. Mr. Kane stated that the awnings need to more

exactly relate to the windows which they are over. Mr. Petruziello stated that the color needs to be toned down. Mr. Carroll stated that the client was considering silver. Mr. Carroll offered the Signing Dog to the UDO archives when it is removed from the wall.

motion

Tabled by applicant.

Things to consider:

- **The alternate sign design was preferred.**
- **Sign on the corner was preferred.**
- **Nettare more vertical, possibly at a diagonal.**
- **Awnings related to the openings below.**
- **Signing Dog sign to UDO archives.**

3.

applicant:
to be reviewed:
~ 7:00

1998 North High Street

Buckeye Donut

Ed Spires (Buckeye Building Solutions, Ltd.), Jimmy Barouxis (Owner)
sign

Mr. Ferdelman presented several slides and reviewed the facts of the application. Mr. Petruziello commented that the building is looking good, Mr. Kane concurred. Ms. Uhas-Sauer stated that the old sign works well with the new façade. Mr. Goodman asked about the construction of the sign. Mr. Spires stated that he is the General Contractor and is not familiar with the details of the letters. Mr. Ferdelman responded that he was in contact with the sign fabricator; the letters are 1” thick acrylic channel letters that are stud mounted – flush. Mr. Petruziello asked whether the letters could be offset from the wall surface. Mr. Ferdelman stated that he had asked the sign fabricator the same question and was informed that they should be set flush. Mr. Grado stated that the drawings are not accurate. The Board and applicant commented about how the drawings did not match that which was built. Mr. Spires replied that the storefront had to be modified due to actual site conditions that included steel beams and posts in locations that were not reflected in the drawing from the Architect. Mr. Goodman stated that he believes the signs are less than they could be. Mr. Petruziello commented that the Moy’s side is really off. Mr. Goodman commented that the signs might look better in black. Mr. Barouxis stated that the signs could be jazzier. Mr. Petruziello stated that jazzy is not necessary. Mr. Barouxis asked whether the font should change. Mr. Petruziello stated the font was fine. Mr. Grado commented that Chinese Restaurant could be in sign panel; then Moy’s could be made into a blade sign. Mr. Grado continued that the blade sign would be mounted in the sign panel between Chinese and Restaurant. Mr. Horne asked for accurate drawings prior making an assessment of the proposal.

motion

Tabled by applicant.

Things to consider:

- **Letters offset from façade to create shadow.**
- **Possible Halo lit letters.**
- **Possible blade sign for Moy’s mounted between Chinese and Restaurant.**
- **Accurate drawing/image of façade is mandatory with correctly scaled signs and dimensions.**

4.

applicant:
to be reviewed:
~ 7:15

1810 North Fourth Street

4th Street Bar & Grill / House of Brews

Tony Colisimo(3D Group Architects)
awnings, patio & sitework

Mr. Ferdelman presented several slides and reviewed the facts of the application. Mr. Ferdelman expressed the staff position that conditional approval should be granted as long as the awnings be limited to width of the openings. Mr. Colisimo presented drawings to the Board and described several changes. Mr. Horne questioned whether the awnings were as depicted in the rendering or as drawn in the CD’s. Mr. Colisimo stated that the awnings should be as shown in his drawings; the rendering s will be modified. The Board questioned the text on each awning. Mr. Petruziello asked what the “Featuring” text on the middle awning was referring to. Ms. Uhas-Sauer asked whether the restaurant side was still going to be a diner. Mr. Colisimo stated yes, in fact a menu was

presented at a UAC meeting several months ago. Ms. Uhas-Sauer questioned the term “Bar & Grill” on the awning; the project has consistently been sold throughout the approval process as a diner. Ms. Uhas-Sauer asked whether it would be better to stay with the diner concept because bar & grill has other social connotations; patrons will quickly figure out that the place sells alcohol. Mr. Colisimo stated that the concept for this business start with the beer coolers. Mr. Petruziello asked for clarification of the dual uses of the linked space. Mr. Colisimo declared that it is most like Spagios, where you go in one door for the alcohol and the other for the restaurant. Mr. Goodman asked why the business was not called Positively 4th Street? Mr. Colisimo answered that the client had grown tired of the name. Ms. Uhas-Sauer stated that she liked the 4th Street logo. Mr. Colisimo restated that the suggestion was for the business to be called a "Diner" rather than "Bar & Grill." Mr. Goodman suggested that the "Featuring" should also be eliminated. Mr. Petruziello clarified that the awnings should just be over the openings within the facade. Mr. Horne pointed out several errors within the drawing; specifically that the storefront windows do not go to the edges of the building, there brick at the corners. Mr. Colisimo concurred. The Board coalesced around the idea that the awnings reflect the window bays. Mr. Grado suggested that the 4th Street logo might look good on the center awning with Diner on one side and House of Brews on the other. Mr. Petruziello suggested placing the individual addresses on the apron of each awning. Mr. Colisimo stated that he expected shop drawings to be coming from Capital City Awning once the design. Mr. Goodman asked for a motion on the awnings. Mr. Petruziello clarified that the shop drawings should reflect the true width of the openings as measured on site.

motion	<p>To approve the proposed awnings as submitted with the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the awnings be the width by the openings below. • That on the center awning the text "Featuring" shall be removed and replaced with the 4th Street logo. • That the restaurant shall be called 4th Street Diner. • That the addresses be placed on the transoms or on the aprons of the awnings. • That the shop drawings be submitted to staff for review of compliance to conceptual design.
motion by vote	<p>Mr. Kane / Mr. Petruziello</p> <p>7-0 to Approve</p>

Mr. Goodman asked for comments on the site. Mr. Colisimo described the fences at rear and the piers and fences at the front of the building. Mr. Horne asked about the concerns related to the patio. Mr. Grado stated that the UAC was clear that the use of the patio was not permitted and the Ordinance from City Council makes it clear that the use of the patio was not part of the Variance from the parking requirements; as stated in a memo from Shannon Pine, the case planner. Mr. Colisimo stated that the terrace or patio is already there, how can it be improved without these elements. Mr. Grado stated that the patio could be improved though without the fence and brick piers. Mr. Colisimo stated that the patio will be 14" above grade and asked whether that would be a safety issue. Mr. Grado replied that the patrons should not be served excessive alcohol. Mr. Horne asked for clarification of the issue regarding fencing off the patio area. Mr. Grado responded that the UAC was resolute about not allowing a bar at this location surrounded on all sides by residential uses. Mr. Grado continued that the UAC only acquiesced to the use variance of the building when it was certain that the business was a diner, not a bar, and that patio was not to be used for outdoor dining or as a means of congregation. Mr. Grado clarified that he would not grant an approval for the fence. Mr. Petruziello stated that by code one does not need to provide a railing for a grade differential that small. Mr. Grado stated that he believed that the building code requires a railing for areas offset at a distance greater than 18". The Board and applicant discuss several options for providing a ramp. Mr. Goodman stated that we have a zoning issue overlapping an architectural issue; the railing and piers are an improvement and should be approved. Mr. Petruziello stated that the variance approval should not limit these applicants from installing the railings and piers. Mr. Grado replied that over time the fact that the railing is there would encourage the use for seating; there would be no way to enforce the non-use of the patio. Mr. Horne offered a suggestion of removing a portion of the patio and installing a ramp and walkway closer to the building and then the remainder would be lawn. Mr. Petruziello stated that removing portions of the patio and adding landscaping may be cheaper than capping the existing patio. Mr. Goodman stated that possibly the patio could be added as a use once the management of the business has proved to be harmonious with the neighborhood. Mr. Grado concurred with the sentiment. Mr. Goodman stated that simplicity should rule. Mr. Kane stated that the patio as proposed would be an attractive nuisance; who would not want to sit out on the proposed improved patio. Mr. Kane stated that Mr. Colisimo and the client should consider a simple solution that cleans up the existing patio that allows the business to open. The Board and applicant discuss possible locations for a ramp. Mr. Petruziello suggested the ramp at the door to the rear; it is closer to the accessible parking space. Mr. Petruziello reiterated Mr. Kane's stance of pursuing simple fixes that allow the business to open then pursue the patio at a future date. Mr. Petruziello stated that the fence at the rear should be level at the top, the bottom part of the fence can and should fluctuate with grade and other landscape elements.

motion

To approve the proposed fences at the rear of the building on the condition:

- **That tops of all fences are set level at a certain height.**

motion by
vote

Mr. Petruziello / Mr. Kane
7-0 to Approve

Mr. Goodman asked about the issues with the red paint. Mr. Ferdelman discussed the problem the contractor is having with the paint removal product. Mr. Petruziello stated that the product is influenced by temperature. Mr. Goodman commented about another site at Russell & High that removed all the paint from a facade. Mr. Petruziello stated that the red paint is disagreeable; the owner should consider a dark color. Mr. Horne suggested calling a masonry restoration specialist. Mr. Colisimo described the concern of where the paint should stop on the front and side elevation. Mr. Petruziello stated that an arbitrary line should be picked. Mr. Kane stated that the top of the storefronts seems to be logical. Ms. Petruziello asked about the window sills. Mr. Colisimo stated that they could be painted a light grey. Ms. Uhas-Sauer suggested that the window frames be painted a darker color than the sills, and the sills should not be white. Mr. Kane suggested that a color scheme be developed. Mr. Horne commented that he would still like to see the paint removed; Mr. Grado concurred.

motion

Tabled by applicant.

Things to consider:

- **Consider removal of the red paint.**
- **If red paint cannot be removed a dark color should be selected (dark gray to black).**
- **Paint window frames on second floor.**
- **Paint sills a light grey/tan, not white.**

5.

applicant:
to be reviewed:
~ 7:30

257-259 Chittenden Avenue
Hakeem Shittu (Owner)
porch removal, stair replacement

Residential Code Enforcement

Mr. Ferdelman presented several slides and reviewed the facts of the application. Mr. Shittu described the history that led to the removal of the porch. Mr. Goodman explained the definition of Contributing Building and how the changes made to the subject property made it not compliant. Mr. Shittu showed the Board images of a porch several doors down. Mr. Grado stated that the applicant could be prosecuted for the work done to the building. Mr. Ferdelman clarified that the applicant is at the stage of being brought before the environmental court. Mr. Graver commented that the stoops shown are a temporary fix and have been since 2007. Mr. Goodman asked whether there was any corrective improvements that could be considered. Mr. Kane stated that the board wants to work with the applicant but at present there is nothing they can respond to except for what is evident on the building. Mr. Petruziello stated that Mr. Shittu needs to hire a design professional to illustrate an appropriate response to the comments from the Board. Mr. Shittu asked whether the porch had to be a replica of what was removed. Several Board members commented that the porch did not. Mr. Horne stated that the porch had to be similar but not a replica. Mr. Petruziello stated that a specific proposal with detailed drawings are to be expected for review. Mr. Ferdelman described the options available to the applicant.

motion

To approve the proposal as built:

- **Removal of porch**
- **Installation of wood stoops**
- **Installation of entry doors**

motion by
vote

Mr. Kane / Mr. Grado
0-7 to Approve (Disapproved)

- C.**
- -
 -
 -
 -
- Staff Issued Certificates of Approval**
- | | |
|--|----------------------------------|
| 1755-1757 North 4 th Street | windows |
| 141 East 15 th Avenue | roof |
| 43 East 18th Avenue | roof |
| 1514 Hamlet Avenue | siding, porch (code enforcement) |
| 1832 Indianola Avenue | windows & doors |
-
- D.**
- -
 -
- Board Approved Applications Issued Certificates of Approval**
- | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------|
| 2060 North High Street (Ohio Stater) | sign approved 2/25/2010 | issued 3/15/2010 |
| 2650 North High Street (CSL Plasma) | signs approved 2/25/2010 | issued 2/18/2010 |
| 94-96 Mc Millen Avenue (Multi-family) | addition & remodel approved 1/28/2010 | issued 3/16/2010 |
-
- E.**
- -
- Board Organization**
- Administer oath to reappointed members
 - Elect Chair
 - Mr. Grado nominated Ted Goodman as Chair / seconded by Mr. Graver / 7-0 Approved
-
- F.**
-
- New Business**
- UARB expanded boundary (Lane Avenue)
 - Mr. Ferdelman described the expansion of the UARB as requested by the UAC.
 - Mr. Kane motioned: To support the recommendation of the UAC to expand the boundaries of the UID to correspond to the UCO district on West Lane Avenue from North High Street to the Olentangy River / seconded by Mr. Petruziello / 7-0 Approved
-
- G.**
- Next Meeting**
- Thursday April 22, 2009 / 6:30pm / Northside Branch Library / 1423 North High Street